



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

The subplot of the play is as follows : Amid the great lamentation attending the death of Petronia's husband, Calista, Petronia's youngest sister, makes a vow that she will become an inmate of Diana's temple, and by a life devoted to chastity, share the grief of her sister. Later, however, she confesses to her lover, Philanthes, that she would break her oath if she dared. Philanthes, unable to persuade her to renounce her vow, tells her that he has a sister called Divina, exactly like him in face and voice, who is soon to enter Diana's temple. He requests Calista to receive Divina as a sister. Then, of course, he disguises himself as Divina, and enters the temple with Calista. The two very soon find that the Temple of Diana is devoted to the opposite of chastity. Calista confesses to Divina that if her lover were close by she would no longer keep her vow ; whereupon Philanthes throws off his disguise. The lovers agree to remain in the temple, and under the appearance of inmates, enjoy their love. But the spying maid who serves the matron of the temple, having overheard this plot, reveals the situation to her mistress. The matron plans to surprise Calista and Philanthes at midnight. At the appointed time she is aroused by her maid, gets out of bed, and hurriedly throws something over her head. This proves to be nothing else than the monk's hood of her paramour, Ignatius, the confessor of the temple. She succeeds in surprising the lovers : Calista stoutly maintains that her companion is the chaste maid, Divina ; the matron declares that Divina is Calista's secret lover. In the midst of the uproar, Calista, spying the hood of the confessor, accuses the matron, and thus quickly turns the tables. Caught in her guilt, the matron agrees to let the lovers off, provided they keep her fault secret.

The source of the subplot is Boccaccio's *Decamerone*, ix, 2. The short outline prefixed to the story is as follows :

“Levasi una badessa in fretta e al buio, per trovare una sua monaca, a lei accusata, col suo amante nel letto ; ed essendo con lei un prete, credendosi il saltero de' veli aver posto in capo, le brache del prete vi si pose : le quali vedendo l'accusata, e fattalane accorgere, fu deliberata ed ebbe agio di starsi col suo amante.”

The literary value of the piece is slight. It

is interesting chiefly as a dramatization of the Matron of Ephesus theme, already handled by Chapman in *The Widow's Tears*, and by later playwrights.

JOSEPH QUINCY ADAMS, JR.

Cornell University.

---

## MY PRONUNCIATION OF GERMAN *r*.

N. B.—Throughout this article, I shall make use of the terminology of the Visible Speech System as it is to be found in Dr. Henry Sweet's works. The symbols are, as far as expedient, taken from the alphabet of the *Association phonétique internationale*, and will enable those not acquainted with the above-mentioned system to follow my exposition.

The object of this article is to describe my natural pronunciation of *r*, as it is met with among educated speakers in the North-western part of Germany. My attention was drawn to this subject in particular by the many contradictory statements found in phonetic literature with regard to this question ; and also by the difficulty experienced by foreigners trying to imitate the sound—or rather sounds—of *r* heard in the Standard pronunciation. Phoneticians, as a rule, do not afford much help in this intricate matter, most of them recommending a sort of *bogus* pronunciation, based on theories and considerations of æsthetics rather than on actual observation. Apart from this practical purpose, it will be highly interesting to the student of language to see, how a sound—being itself as far as we know derived from two sources : primitive Gmc. *r* and *z*, from older *s*—is now developing in three different directions, thus demonstrating what possibilities one must be prepared to encounter when investigating the history of human speech, especially in its more primitive stages.

The strongly trilled point-open consonant [r], the *litera canina* of the early orthoepists—“called thus from the snarling of dogs”—still prevalent in the country dialects as inherited from the Arian mother-tongue, was, in Standard French and German, replaced by an imitation totally different in place and form. This sound, described as the guttural or uvular *r* [R]—identical with the so-

called Northumbrian burr<sup>1</sup>—is produced by the uvula vibrating against the back part of the tongue. It may have a disagreeable effect upon the ears of those not accustomed to it, especially in the form into which it has later on developed in my pronunciation: but, after all, it is the “received sound” of educated speech. The point-trill [r], artificially reserved to the pulpit and the stage, which is recommended by some as the “Olde and established Name” of *r*, never fails to convey the idea of rusticity when used in ordinary conversation or reading; whereas the English point-*r* [ɹ] produced with only one movement of the tongue, is absolutely unknown in Germany, thus betraying at once the nationality of the speaker.

In the same way as the original *r* was weakened in Standard English, the guttural trill was pronounced with less energy; the uvula was not made to vibrate: all that remained of the articulation was the forming of a narrow passage by the back part of the tongue against the soft palate (velum). The result may be regarded as a retracted variety of the back-open-voice [g], which actually is the sound with which Dr. Sweet renders German *r* in *all* positions, a statement which I cannot but regard with some suspicion.

In order, thus, to explain the various sounds representing older *r* in my pronunciation, it is necessary to go back to an ordinary back-open-voice [g], the voiced variety of German *ch* after back-vowels [ɔ], identical with the sound of intervocalic *g* in the same position.

This sound [g] (the voiced velar spirant) has been preserved:

1) in the beginning of words:

e. g. *rot* [gōt];  
*Riese* [gīzə];  
*Rabe* [gābə];

<sup>1</sup> This sound is more frequent among English speakers than it is usually thought to be. When in the North of Scotland—Wright's North-eastern division—I was surprised at the exceptionally large number of persons who used this sound regularly, not as belonging to a compact mass of dialect speakers, but as an individual habit. In the Aberdeen schools, as many as 10 per cent. of the children are found using this burr, a great number of whom never acquire the proper pronunciation.

2) medially, between voiced sounds:

a) after back-vowels, where it may not be distinguished from the written *g*:

e. g. *waren* } [vāgn];  
       *(wagen)* }  
*Fuhre* } [fūgə];  
       *(Fuge)* }  
*bohren* } [bōgn];  
       *(Bogen)* }

β) after front-vowels; the *g* in the same position is rendered with the front-open-voice [j], and consequently does not coincide with the *r* in the same position:

e. g. *rühren* [gŷgn] — *rügen* [gŷjn];  
*leeren* [lēgn] — *legen* [lējn];  
*Möhre* [māgə] — *möge* [mājə];

3) finally, only as the representative of a long (or double) *r*; it is not unvoiced, unlike all other final open consonants:

e. g. *Narr* [nag];  
*wirr* [vig].

In the neighbourhood of voiceless consonants, the sound of *r* is partially affected, being unvoiced to some extent, especially in rapid speech. This, however, being a natural process that always will occur in these cases, it is not necessary to mark it in our phonetic transcription:

e. g. *Sarg* [zagē];  
*tragen* [tgāgn];  
*frieren* [fgīgn].

There is only one exception to this rule, *r* becoming quite voiceless before *t*, developing into the back-open-breath [x], so that it coincides with the sound of *ch* after back-vowels:

e. g. *narrt* (3 sg. prs.) } [naxt];  
       *(Nacht)* }  
*warte* (imp.) } [vaxt];  
       *(wachte, 3 sg. prt.)* }  
*Mord* } [mɔxt];  
       *(mocht')* }

but there is a distinction in the case of front-vowels:

e. g. *Wirt, wird* [vixt];  
*Wicht* [viçt].

When final, the short (or single) *r* has been lowered still further—so much so that no conso-

nantal friction is produced : the result is a vowel which may be described as the high-back-wide. It is the unrounded form of the short English (and German) *u* in *foot*, *put*, *book*, etc. Those trying to pronounce it by unrounding that familiar sound should be very careful not to overdo it by *spreading* the lips—which only too readily happens in a case like this. The lips should remain in what might be described as a neutral position. For this new sound I propose to use the symbol [a], which seems to be quite appropriate for a vowel the acoustic effect of which is very similar to that of [a].

e. g. *wir* [vīa];  
*ohr* [ōa];  
*flur* [flūa];  
*star* [tāa].

Final unstressed *-er*, so frequent as a termination, has assumed the same sound, the [ε] having been completely merged in the [a].

e. g. *jeder* [jēda];  
*heber* [lēba];  
*bürger* [bygja].

The same pronunciation prevails when the *-er* is followed by an inflectional *n* or *m*; thus, *-ern* and *-en* can be easily distinguished although the *r* is no longer pronounced as a consonant.

e. g. *bessern* [besan];  
*Büchern* [bȳçan];  
*Bürgern* [bygjan] }  
*bürge* [bygjn]. }

HEINRICH MUTSCHMANN.

Bonn.

## THE WORKS OF JEAN RENART, POET, AND THEIR RELATION TO GALE- RAN DE BRETAGNE. I.

In an article which was found among the papers of Gaston Paris, and published a few years ago in the *Romania*,<sup>1</sup> the suggestion is offered that the Jean Renart, who wrote the *Lai de l'Ombre*,<sup>2</sup> is

the author also of the romance of *Escoufle*,<sup>3</sup> and probably the writer to whom we owe the poem of *Guillaume de Dole*.<sup>4</sup> This idea had already been advanced by Paul Meyer,<sup>5</sup> with especial reference to *Ombre* and *Escoufle*, and seems to have been entertained somewhat later by Adolph Mussafia in regard to *Escoufle* and *Guillaume de Dole*.<sup>6</sup> Neither Meyer nor Mussafia coincide with Paris' view to its entire extent, nor do they agree with each other in their choice of poems, but their statements and proofs so overlap that we may take it for granted that a new study of the subject would lead them to a practical unanimity of opinion. And this opinion would be the one expressed by Gaston Paris.

Should this belief in the common authorship of *Ombre*, *Escoufle* and *Guillaume de Dole* become general, and the three poems be regarded as the work of one and the same man, then Jean Renart, who is named only in *Ombre*, takes rank among the best French poets of the Middle Ages. Indeed, he might be safely assigned a place second only to Wace, Marie de France, Benoît de Sainte-More, Thomas and Chrétien de Troyes. *Escoufle* and *Guillaume de Dole* are counted among the most important of the *romans d'aventure*. The popularity of *Ombre* is attested by its presence in not less than six manuscripts. Consequently we are doing only tardy justice to Jean Renart in calling him from out the crowd of minor poets to a seat among the greater ones. At the same time, in restoring to him what is his own we are diminishing, to our regret, the already limited number of talented men who were engaged in the cultivation of the vernacular. Three poets of considerable ability would be combined in one. The literary reputation of Jean Renart, therefore, is not alone concerned in the decision that may be reached. The consideration in which the educated classes of the day held composition in the mother tongue is also involved to a certain ex-

<sup>3</sup> Edited by H. Michelant and P. Meyer for the *Société des anciens textes français*, Paris, 1894.

<sup>4</sup> Edited by G. Servois for the *Société des anciens textes français*, Paris, 1893.

<sup>5</sup> See Introduction to *Escoufle*, pp. xli-l.

<sup>6</sup> See *Sitzungsberichte der phil.-hist. Classe der kaiserl. Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Vienna, 1896, Abh. xiv; 1897, Abh. vii. In latter article, p. 33, n. 1.

<sup>1</sup> Vol. xxxii, 481-551. See particularly pp. 487, 488.

<sup>2</sup> Edited by Joseph Bédier, Fribourg, 1890.